

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 23, 2003, Applicant herein amends the above-identified application and responds as follows:

Claims 7-12 remain in this application. Claims 7 and 10 have been amended. The Examiner's indication of the allowability of Claims 9 and 12, if rewritten in independent form including the base claim, is acknowledged and appreciated.

Claims 7-8 and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,482) in view of Duree et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,393). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection because the cited references, considered either alone or combination with each other, do not teach or suggest the features as claimed, in particular, in independent Claims 7 and 10.

First of all, and even as noted by the Examiner in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the signal transfer point (ATP) disclosed in the Christie reference serves to *convert* point codes (first and second signaling point codes) which designate the "origination and destination signaling points for the message." The Examiner, however, has erroneously attempted to equate such point codes with the claimed "first and second destination point codes" of the present invention.

Applicant wishes to emphasize that pursuant to the present invention, each mode includes two destination point codes for respectively supporting short and long messages. Indeed, the point codes of the present invention are not, in fact, ever converted in the STPs as with the Christie reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the origination and destination signaling point codes disclosed in the Christie reference do not teach or suggest the first and second destination point codes of the present invention.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's determination that the Duree reference teaches to use a second destination point code to make full use of the longer and unsegmented message length. Duree does disclose that N-ISUP messages, accordingly to the traditional MTP, are transported via Q.703 links. Duree further discloses that it is possible to transport N-ISUP messages, according to a modified MTP, via broadband links (specifically, ATM links). However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Duree reference does not teach or suggest an STP having Q.703 links and ATM links and also two separate destination point codes as an address, wherein it can be assured in a message that other STPs can transport this message via ATM links to the address STP by using the second destination point code as an address.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 7 and 10, as amended, as well as Claims 8-9 and 11-12 which respectively depend therefrom, are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely notice of allowance be issued in the case.

It is further submitted that a three-month extension of time of \$950.00 is due in connection with this response at this time. In addition, if any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0112740-055) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

William E. Vaughan
Reg. No. 39,056
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4292\

Dated: June 23, 2004